

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. 50.—No. 1.] LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 3, 1824. [Price 1s.

MR. ROBINSON'S HOUSE:

OR,

"THE WISDOM OF PARLIAMENT."

"BE it enacted, by the King's
"Most Excellent Majesty, by and
"with the consent of the Lords
"Spiritual and Temporal, &c. . .
" . . . That, in every case in
"which a verdict or judgment by
"default shall be had against any
"person for composing, printing,
"or publishing any seditious libel,
"TENDING to bring into ha-
"tred or CONTEMPT, either
"HOUSE OF PARLIA-
"MENT, &c. . . the per-
"son so convicted shall, for a
"second offence, be adjudged, at
"the discretion of the Court,
"either to suffer such punishment
"as may now by law be inflicted,
"as in cases of high misdemea-
"nors, or to be BANISHED
"FROM THE UNITED
"KINGDOM, and all other
"parts of His Majesty's dominions,
"for such term of years as the
"Court shall order."

Six-Acts, passed December 30, 1819.

Kensington, 30th March, 1824.

I CALL it Mr. Robinson's House
by way of double compliment to
that Gentleman and to that House.

My readers cannot have forgotten
the lofty eulogium, pronounced
by that Gentleman upon that
House; how he praised it for its
wisdom, how he extolled it for all
the blessings which we enjoy;
how he lashed the Radicals for
having calumniated and vilified
that House; how he said that the
House had made the country
joyous, smiling in plenty, happy
and contented; how he made us
go upon our marrowbones in ex-
pressing gratitude to the Great
House that had showered down
blessings upon us; and (Oh Lord!)
how he received "LOUD AND
"LONG-CONTINUED
"CHEERS FROM ALL
"PARTS OF THE HOUSE."

One single newspaper, pub-
lished on Friday the 26th March,
contains reports relating to pro-
ceedings in this same House.
These proceedings appertain to
four distinct subjects; the Game,
the Poor, the Turnpikes, and the

Trade. Well, then, seeing that the House was so praised, and that it so cheered the praiser, let us take a look at the proceedings to which I have just alluded. I may observe in the way of preliminary, that the Ministers themselves, particularly Mr. CANNING, have recently declared in the House, that *great advantages result from the publication of the debates*. I am of a contrary opinion; if advantage to the nation be meant. The reasons for this opinion, it is not, at present, my business to state. I take the thing as it is; but, if the Minister approve of the publication of the debates, and if the House (the Great House itself), silently give its assent to such publication for ages and ages; if this be the case, we have surely a right to *comment upon the debates*. I think it impossible to deny us this right; for if this be denied us, this publication of debates is a very pretty thing after all. We are to keep our ears open, but our mouths are to be shut: we are to enjoy the charm of *reading* the delightful speeches, but the affair is too sacred for us to offer an opinion upon!

However, this will not do! This it is impossible to stand. Better be banished right away, and even

in the Irish fashion. I remember, that that venerable personage the Lord Chancellor, said that the Bill was *spoiled*, when the banishment was put in [instead of the *transportation*! O God! I thank thee for certain circumstances which affect this man! I will name the circumstances another time. Those who know him well will know what I mean; and if they be just persons, they will with me, rejoice at those circumstances. What! TRANSPORT a man, because he may have written words having a *tendency* to bring into contempt that House which passed the Marriage Act of 1822, which passed Peel's Bill, which passed the Small Note Bill: but, why need I cite instances of this sort? *Transport* a man for this! What must we not comment, then, on the publications put forth as the Debates of this House? Are these the laws of England? Yes, faith, they are, though the brutal blackguards of the London Press did, until I almost thumped the breath out of their bodies, boast of English freedom of the Press, as compared with the state of the Press in France and Spain. The two Letters, one from the People of France, and the other from the People of Spain, to the People of

England, did infinite service. They made the base toad-eaters of the London Press hang their heads. They have never since been so bold.

Comment on these reports we must, however, or we are the very basest slaves that the world ever saw; and yet, if we do comment on them, in any other way than that of *eulogium*, we are liable to be banished for it. If we call the debates, debates of the House of Commons, and if we say any thing in disapprobation of any part of the debates, we say that which has a tendency more or less direct to bring the House into *contempt*: and this subjects us to the liability to *banishment*, and for life, too. It is not correct, perhaps, to call the thing *debates*. It is a report of proceedings in the House. Mr. CANNING says it is of great use to publish those proceedings. Of what use can it be, unless we are freely to give our opinions upon those proceedings? If our opinions differ from those of the House; and if we state them clearly and ably, and show that the projects of the House are absurd and impracticable, and ludicrous into the bargain; does not all this tend, and immediately, tend to bring the House into contempt? Certainly it does.

We incur the risk of banishment, then, by this commentary; and yet there are reptiles base enough to say that the Press is *more free* here than it is in France! The Chancellor said he thought that the Bill was spoiled when the transportation was taken out of it. Most people think that the banishment clause is pretty well for a "*free press*." However, I shall not comment on any thing as proceedings of Mr. FREDERICK ROBINSON'S House. I shall comment on nothing as the productions of legislators from GATTON and OLD SARUM. I deal only with these stupid devils of newspapers. They have put forth certain publications. I know not who are the real authors of these publications. They call them speeches, and they say that these speeches were made in the House of Commons. I know nothing of that. I find the stuff (and glorious stuff it is), in the newspapers; and as such I remark upon it; beginning with the following extract relative to the Game, which extract I take from the Morning Chronicle of the 26th March.

On the motion of Mr. S. Wortley, the House resumed the consideration of the Report of the Committee on the Game Laws Amendment Bill, and the Bill was recommitted.

The Preamble was postponed.

The first Clause, repealing certain

parts of former Acts relating to Game, was agreed to.

On the second Clause, a discussion of considerable length ensued. The clause is as follows :—

“ And be it further enacted, That all hares, rabbits, pheasants, partridges, grouse, black game, heath and moor game, bustards, woodcocks, snipes, quails, landrails, wild ducks, teal and widgeons, and the young and eggs thereof, found in or upon any inclosed land, are and shall be deemed to be the property of the person or persons, body or bodies politic, corporate or collegiate, seised of, or entitled as owner or owners thereof in possession (and not in reversion) to, the land on which the same shall be found; and all hares, rabbits, pheasants, partridges, grouse, black game, heath and moor game, bustards, woodcocks, snipes, quails, landrails, wild ducks, teal and widgeons, found in and upon any stinted pasture, uninclosed common, or waste land, are and shall be deemed to be the property of the lord or lady, lords or ladies of the manor, lordship or royalty within which such stinted pasture, uninclosed common or waste land shall be situated; and it shall be lawful for the person or persons, body or bodies politic, corporate or collegiate, so entitled to the property of the Game within their own lands, and for the lord or lady, lords or ladies of the manor, lordship or royalty so entitled to the property in the Game on such stinted pasture, uninclosed common or waste lands respectively, to demise and let the Game to be found therein.”

Sir J. Shelley objected to the clause that the proprietor of the soil could take or kill game upon it, but could not give the right of doing so to another person.

Lord Milton asked whether, if this clause were agreed to, it would preclude the right of making any remarks on the new descriptions of game introduced in it? He observed in the enumeration contained in the clause that woodcocks, which are not

game by the common law of the land, are made so by the present measure, and that rabbits, teal and widgeons are also included. This was an enormous extension of the system of the Game Laws, of which the people of England complained so justly as a grievance. The object of the Bill was, as he conceived, to mitigate that grievance, and to diminish the mass of crime which every man complained of from one end of the country to the other [hear, hear!]. It was therefore inconsistent with the object which they professed, to extend the operation of the Game Laws to a great variety of animals not heretofore included. He objected to the whole clause, and the Bill altogether, though he was prepared with no plan of his own upon the subject. On the contrary, what he wanted was to get rid of legislation. They had already legislated too much on that as well as on other subjects. By the present Bill, they would have half a dozen lords of the manor where they had but one before. He objected particularly to that clause which vests in the occupier of fifty acres of land a property in things not capable of being made property. As to the sale of game, he approved of it, and was favourable to the principle of doing away all penalties on the sale of game.

Sir John Sebright said, that the Game Laws were unpopular, because they confined to an exclusive class the privilege of shooting game. But was it unpopular, he would ask, to open this privilege to other classes, who had been hitherto exposed to considerable penalties for sharing in this amusement? For his own part, he looked to the measure as attended with many conveniences. As the law stood at present, he could make no return to many of his neighbours for civilities; his wish would be, not to give them game, for they could buy it, and would continue to buy it, however that House might accumulate laws to the contrary; and, he would say, they ought to buy it when they could, and how they could, in

spite of all legislative enactments; his wish would be to make them the compliment of a day's shooting, but that he could not do in many instances, for some qualified gentleman, or some pauper in the workhouse who happened to be the son of an Esquire, might object to the amusement of the respectable tradesman, who had perhaps waited with great patience for his bill [a laugh.] Notwithstanding the objections of the Noble Lord, he had no hesitation in saying that a more popular measure could not be brought forward. As the law now stood, a man could not shoot a hare in his own defence [a laugh:] and no one could persuade him that it was not just and reasonable to mitigate a system so *fraught with illiberality and injustice.*

Mr. Bernal expressed an apprehension, that by making game the property of the landowner, a person who had taken game away would be *guilty of felony.* Before he could agree to the clause which made it property, he would wish to hear a satisfactory answer to that doubt.

Mr. Monck said, that the person guilty of such an offence would be a trespasser, and liable to punishment as such by the common law. He thought, however, that it would be better to leave out the enumeration of birds not considered as game by the existing Statutes, and therefore he would move an Amendment to that effect.

Mr. R. Smith objected to the extension of the laws of property to game, as it might have a tendency to increase the rigours of the system, and to excite bad feelings between the higher and lower classes of the community.

Mr. S. Wortley declared himself willing to agree to the omission of all the words after the word *game.*

Mr. Monck wished to know whether it was certain that no action or indictment could be maintained for that kind of property. His own opinion was that it could not.

Mr. S. Wortley said, that as the

penalty was stated in subsequent clauses, the punishment was defined.

The Amendment was then agreed to, as were also several verbal Amendments.

Mr. Bernal repeated his question.

Lord J. Russell concurred with him in opinion, that an action might be maintained if game should be made property.

Mr. S. Wortley said he would make inquiries on the subject, and if he found it was the case, it would be easy to propose a clause providing that no other penalty should attach to the offence than those contained in the subsequent clauses.

The clause was then agreed to.

Mr. Goulburn opposed the clause. He said that at present lords of manors, he believed the majority of them, enjoyed the right of shooting over their manors, although they were not the owners of the soil. He was himself in this case; he was a Lord of a Manor, and owner of the tithes, and for him his rights as Lord of the Manor were as perfect, as far as shooting was concerned, as if he were the owner of the land; pass this Bill, and his rights would be entirely destroyed. It was an invasion of a very ancient right, and he should oppose it.

Mr. Bernal defended the clause. Manorial rights were only by sufferance; and Gentlemen who made themselves respected in their neighbourhood would, after the passing of this Act, have the same privileges and enjoyments as before. Manorial rights were of no value.

Sir John Wrottesley agreed with Mr. Goulburn, that this clause would be an invasion of very ancient rights, and he wished to see those rights his ancestors bequeathed him preserved. He had long appointed two gamekeepers, which this Bill would deprive him of.

Sir John Sebright said, he believed the Hon. Baronet who had just sat down, was allowed only to appoint his gamekeepers by sufferance. As to what had fallen from the Right

Hon. Gentleman opposite, he would observe, that his possessing the tithes gave him a great power over the property of the parish — a power which was indeed so great, that he (Sir J. Sebright), though a great tithe-holder himself, thought no man ought to possess it.

Sir J. Wrottesly explained.

Alderman Heygate contended manors were good property. He had known one purchased from Government which had no other quit rents but 5*l.* a year, and no other common belonging to it than a few acres, and for this manorial right 1600*l.* had been given. If this Bill were now to pass, this person would be cheated out of 1400*l.* He trusted the House would protect the rights of lords of manors, which were not so imaginary as some Gentlemen supposed.

Mr. Cripps opposed the clause.

Mr. S. Wortley defended the clause. He had, he admitted, taken something from the lords of manors by his Bill, but he granted them a great deal more than he had taken from them. By this Bill they would have the absolute property in all the game which was found in unenclosed lands. There was so much division of opinion on this clause, that he hoped some Honourable Member would take the sense of the Committee on it.

Lord Milton thought the Bill was a very considerable violation of the right of property, such as ought not to take place without some good reason assigned; and it being clearly made out that great public advantages would ensue. The evils of the Game Laws were not any of those trifling discrepancies in the Qualification Act, of which Gentlemen complained, but the numerous commitments which took place under the Game Laws. Our gaols were filled with persons guilty of no other crime but violations of these laws, and this it should be the great object of the House to remedy. He did not think the Bill of his Honourable Friend at

all calculated to effect this object. It would extend the Game Laws to many manors now not subjected to them, and thus rather tend to increase than diminish the number of crimes. But this was not all. It would make game more valuable, more preserves would be established, and as it would never be possible to make the wild animals of the woods respected as property, in the same manner as other species of property, before he agreed to the clause, he must see its advantages, which he did not at present; on the contrary, he thought it would increase poaching and commitments.

Mr. Secretary Peel said, he had long deliberated whether it would be right to revise the Bill of last Session, permitting the sale of Game, and leaving the whole law of qualification untouched, or whether it would be better to make at once the extensive alteration proposed by his Honourable Friend; and after long consideration, he must confess he was not yet prepared to come to a decision. The Noble Lord appeared to him to express a wish to have all penalties abolished, and to have the Game Laws altogether set aside—(Lord Milton dissented.) He (Mr. Peel) really thought that that was the meaning of the Noble Lord. Such a principle as that would indeed be strange and alarming. It would have the effect of putting arms in the hands of the entire population, and of giving them the right of traversing the country with those arms in their hands, and to kill game wherever game might be found.

Mr. Stuart Wortley said he voted for the Bill of the last Session, because he looked upon it as a step towards the removal of all the Game Laws. It would be the highest act of injustice and oppression to authorize the sale of game—to make game property, leaving that property in the hands of the Lord of the Manor—to say to a man that he should not sell the game which he had on his own land, but that another person, to his

exclusion, should have the right to sell it, was what would be too monstrous to endure.

Mr. Peel said that he wished the experiment to be limited in the first instance.

Sir John Sebright said, that to make game saleable for the benefit of one class of the community, to the exclusion of the other, was what the country would not bear.

Mr. William Bankes said, that the House ought to pause before they throw open to the great class of the people a right, which, from the numbers, the power, and disposition of that class, they never afterwards could recal. He was one of those who considered that a species of property, which had been enjoyed for ages, ought not to be lightly dealt with. He did not conceive that the proposed alteration would have the effect of making the gaols less full, or the people more moral or more contented.

Lord Binning said, that the state of things under the Game Laws was so abominable, that any measure which would afford a chance of escaping from that state he was disposed to consider a benefit. If he were convinced that legalizing the sale of game, without introducing the principle of property, would prove effectual, he would willingly agree to it; he could not indulge that hope. He could not help saying, that what had fallen from the Honourable Member for Yorkshire, had gone a great way to reconcile him to the clause.

After a few words from Lord Milton, Sir John Shelly, Mr. Evans, and Sir John Wrottesley, the House divided on the clause.

Ayes, 82.—Noes, 29.—Majority, 53.

On entering the gallery, we found

Mr. Bernal upon his legs, proposing an Amendment to the clause which gave to landlords the power of sporting over the grounds of their tenants in all cases, whether such a reservation of right were or were not made in the leases. The Honour-

able Member considered this provision most unjust towards the occupiers of farms, as it not only deprived them of a right they now possessed, but conferred it upon their landlords.

Mr. J. Smith supported the Amendment. If tenants were thus deprived of vested rights, some compensation ought to be given to them.

Mr. S. Wortley vindicated the clause as it stood, contending, that if it were not inserted, landlords would in all cases be warned off their own estates by their tenants.

Alderman Heygate insisted, that to pass the clause as it stood, would work most scandalous injustice; it would place the landlord in a far better situation than that he occupied at present.

Mr. Goulburn supported the rights of Lords of Manors.

Colonel Davies agreed with the Honourable Proposer of the Amendment. If it were agreed to, tenants would be just as ready to allow their landlords to sport, as they were under the existing law.

Mr. F. Lewis suggested, that if a tenant were legally qualified to kill game, he ought to be allowed to possess the right, notwithstanding this Bill, in any case where it was granted by his lease. The Lord of the Manor ought to enjoy a concurrent right. A clause, he thought, might be worded to avoid the difficulty at present started.

Sir J. Shelley instanced his own case, arguing that if the clause passed, as now worded, he should be ousted of an important right, for which he had paid a considerable sum.

Mr. Bernal could not consent to any compromise like that proposed by the Honourable Member for Beaumaris.

Colonel Wood was of opinion that if the landlord possessed the right of shooting now, he ought not to be deprived of it. Nevertheless he supported the Amendment, because it was only just to preserve equally the right of the tenant.

Lord Binning said, that as the

question was intricate, it ought to be left for decision on a future day.

Sir J. Wrottesley maintained, that there was no intricacy at all in the point. It would be a monstrous injustice to tenants to pass the clause, as it would give landlords a power they never designed to possess.

Sir T. Acland thought that it was necessary to give landlords some protection, or they would be not in a better, but in a worse situation. He was inclined to leave the parties as nearly as possible in the state in which they at this moment stood: he would not confer upon the landlord any new right, nor allow the tenant, upon whose farm the owner might at present come under the terms of the lease, to warn off the owner. He wished that a declaratory clause upon the subject, should be introduced into the Bill. In leases in general, the landlord reserved the right to sport; but old ladies, and infirm persons, did not always insert a clause for this purpose. As the law stood, the landlord enjoyed certain valuable privileges, and the House ought not, with a suicidal hand, to destroy them.

Mr. J. Martin had supported the Bill in principle originally, but if this clause were inserted without Amendment, he would vote against the measure in every future stage.

Mr. S. Wortley expressed his readiness to postpone the further consideration of the clause until another day. He was satisfied that it ought to be introduced into the Bill in its present shape, in order that justice might be done to all parties. He proposed that the Chairman report progress, and ask leave to sit again to-morrow (this day).

Mr. B. Wilbraham supported this suggestion.

Mr. Brogden accordingly left the Chair, and the House resumed; he brought up the Report, and obtained leave to sit again to-day.

Thus, then, though the Bill had gone through a first and a second reading. Though a great majority of the House, had at the second reading, approved of that which the slang calls, the principle of the Bill; though the Bill had been amended in the Committee before; notwithstanding this, here goes, *smack*, black game, heath and moor game, bustards, woodcocks, snipes, quails, land-rails, wild ducks, teal and widgeons, *out of the list of property*. The amended Bill had swept them out of the list of *Game*; but here they are swept out of the list of *property*; and (hear it, ye gods who preside over Country Gentlemen's brains!) rabbits are left in the list of property, though it is notorious that they feed upon one man's land and sleep upon another's, and that they are no more under the control of any owner than a snipe or a widgeon is.

"The principle of the Bill" is a sort of slang; and you always find that the slang which the newspapers put into the mouths of Members of Parliament; for, observe, it is as much as my life is worth to say that slang ever comes out of their honourable mouths: this slang is the very thing that all your *political prigs* delight in; all your conceited asses, who affect

to be familiar with things which their modest neighbours make a subject of inquiry. I have heard of a prig or two of this sort, down in the Country, who, with straightened-up neck and half-shut eyes, and voice and manner of London footman, talking to the carters, upon his return amongst the smock frocks: I have heard of a prig or two of this sort, dressed neither like gentleman nor like farmer, saying that they "*approved of the principle of the Bill.*" Principle of the Bill! Pray, Mr. Prig, what does the word *principle* mean? The devil a bit do you know; and you only make use of the word, in humble imitation of your betters, the newspaper reporters. There are, man, several principles, in this Bill. The first is, that the *privilege* of the landholder ought to cease; another is, that Game ought to be made an object of purchase and sale; a third is, (or was, when these prigs approved of the principle of the Bill,) that Game should be made property; a fourth was, that rabbits, wild ducks, and other things, should be added to the list of this species of property; a fifth principle was, that this property should be vested in the landowner, and not in the land occupier; a sixth principle

was, that leases should be openly violated in the face of day, in every case, to the advantage of the landlord and to the injury of the tenant; the seventh principle was, that a small landowner should neither keep a snare, nor permit his friends to sport on his land, and that a big landowner should do both; an eighth principle, and the last that I shall mention, was, that, for being in pursuit of Game an hour after sunset, a man might be torn from his family and punished as *a felon*; and that too, observe, by JUSTICES OF THE PEACE AT THEIR QUARTER SESSIONS; that is to say, by men who are appointed and removed at the will of the ministers of the day; by that same description of men who sentenced JOSEPH SWANN; and, which is more than all the rest, by the very men to *whom chiefly the game belongs.*

These are so many *principles*, each of them is a *ground of proceeding*; a root for detail to grow out of. All these, therefore, the political prigs in question *approved of!* Some of these principles have already been swept away; and the Bill can never pass both Houses without the whole of them being swept away; and yet the prigs in question approved of

the principle of the Bill. It is most likely that by *principle of the Bill*, they meant the pulling down, in this one respect, at any rate, of the Lords and Squires to their own level. They do not seem to have cared about the transporting of their poor neighbours; and, indeed, they seem to have wholly overlooked the oppressions intended for themselves. In their excessive eagerness to see the privileges of others abolished, they overlooked Clause 6, which would seize them upon the lands which they themselves rented; which would seize them as trespassers in the fields or garden of their own renting; which would punish them for a trespass on one of their fields; which would send them three months to the Tread-mill for such trespass: the prigs forgot this, in their great eagerness to pull down the Lords and the Squires.

It is impossible for imagination to portray what this Bill will be before it be done with. It will be a curious thing, if it should pass at all, to compare the Act with the Bill, as brought in by its author. In the meanwhile, I cannot help remarking on two or three things which occur in this newspaper publication. Sir JOHN SEBRIGHT has imputed to him, what is very well

worthy of public attention. This used to be a great man against Jacobins and Levellers, and particularly against Radicals. How changed! How amiable, nay, how humble become! The "respectable tradesman," he wants to see with a qualification to hunt and shoot, that respectable tradesman having, perhaps, waited with great patience for his bill! As I read this speech of Sir JOHN SEBRIGHT, who made a monstrous good jest, of the "*Esquire's son now in the workhouse*;" as I was reading this speech about the "respectable tradesman's amusement;" as I was reading this speech; this amiable instance of self-abasement, I could not help asking myself, what Mr. WINDHAM would have said of it, if he had been alive. Sir JOHN seemed quite weary of all worldly power and superiority, for, in another short speech which he is reported to have made, he took occasion to observe, that, "the possession of "*tithes* gave a man great power "over the property of the parish: "a power which was, indeed, so "great, that he, though a great "tithe-holder himself, *thought no "man ought to possess it!*" Well then, this *bright* member (I do not mean a pun) will, doubtless, surrender these tithes; for, if he be

convinced that they give a power which he ought not to possess, he will hardly continue to hold them. Sir John observed, that, as the law now stood, a man could not shoot a hare, in his own *defence*, which, indeed, is very true, even if she were going to jump upon him and bite him. This Knight of the Shire for the county of Hertford (a county famous for bright geniuses) added, that a system so fraught with *illiberality* ought to be mitigated; and, indeed, he talked in a very stout style about the right of his good neighbours, the respectable tradesmen. He said they could buy game, that they would buy game, and that they ought to buy game, where they could and how they could, "*in spite of all legislative enactments*;" that is to say, here is a Member of Parliament declaring that the people ought to disobey the law, ought to set the law at defiance, whenever they could and however they could; and this declaration he is said to make at the same time that he is represented as voting for a Bill, which makes it penal to purchase game of an unlicensed person, a Bill, too, which enables justices of the peace to transport men for seven years for being out in pursuit of game an hour after sunset!

The papa of the Bill, is, in the above - quoted report, stated to have said, that he voted for the Bill of last year, as a step towards the removal of *all the Game Laws*. Well! thus goes on the revolution. This relic of the feudal system, as it was called in a late debate, once taken away, other relics will follow. It is manifest, indeed, that the landowners have long been sinking under the Jews and Jobbers; here they come now to make a surrender of a really valuable privilege attached to the land. At the same time that great injustice is contemplated with regard to the tenants and with regard to the labourers, here is a great offering made at the shrine of the mammon of the funds. However, as I observed in my Letter to Sir JOHN SHELLEY, these things follow one another very naturally. PITT decreed a revolution for England, when he embarked in a war of eight hundred millions of expense.

I shall here leave this Bill for the present; but stick to it I will. It will, by the time that it is done with, enable us to form a just judgment with regard to the wisdom of Mr. FREDERICK ROBINSON'S Parliament. What shape it may be in before this paper comes from the press, I cannot

tell. It may, before it has done, make mice and rats game, and sparrows and tomtits. One thing appears manifest, however, and that is, that the *transportation* part of the Game Laws is to remain. No man that I have heard of, has yet said a word about taking that away. That is a *new* law, mind. That was enacted, for the first time, only about ten years ago. There is a great deal of tenderness about some persons for lords and ladies of manors; and the bright Knight of Hertfordshire talks about the respectable tradesman being deprived of his amusement by some 'Squire's son, now a pauper in the workhouse, perhaps; but he says not a word about transporting men from the Quarter Sessions, for being merely out in pursuit of game an hour after sunset. That is a great leading principle in the Bill, that sporting after sunset is *felony*. Not a word is said against this. The political prigs that I have mentioned before, approve of this principle, too; and, indeed, by the whole mass of them, the life of a man and his family seems to be nothing in comparison with the life of a hare.

In conclusion, how stands this matter with regard to Mr. Frederick Robinson's House? That

House has made law upon law with respect to the game, within the last thirty years. It has gone on making the law more and more severe. The victims to the Game Laws, who were, when I was a boy, counted by ones and twos, in each county, are now counted by hundreds upon hundreds. The stocks and the few weeks' imprisonment in gaol, have been exchanged for the hulks, for Botany Bay, and the gallows. At last, Mr. Gooch told the House, that there were only forty prisoners for poaching (at a certain period) in *one* of the gaols in the county of Norfolk. Out of one hundred and fifteen prisoners in the county of Wilts, fifty-three are imprisoned for what is called poaching. The Secretary of State has lately told the House, that from fifteen hundred, to two thousand men are constantly in gaol for offences against the Game Laws. These men, together with their wives and children, amount to seven or eight thousand persons. Besides this, fightings are continually going on between the night-sportsmen and the game-spies, one of whom, as was proved the other day at the assizes, tied a dead pheasant on the limb of a tree on the outside of a cover, in order to entrap first, and then, to convict and transport a

night-sportsman. In short, the Game Laws have made the country a hell. They have made the common people detest and abhor the landowners. The evil is so great, that something must be done to put an end to it or to mitigate it. And what does the House do? Does it propose to retrace its steps? Does it propose to make the law what it was when the country was happy, and when the people did not detest and abhor the landowners? No: no Member proposes any such thing as this; but there is a proposition before the House, still to continue the transporting law, and, of course, to continue all the fightings that are now working such mischief and disgrace; there is a proposition to continue this new and terrible law, and, at the same time, to surrender a privilege, to surrender to the Jews and Jobbers, a privilege which has always belonged to the land.

Thus has *worked* the House of Mr. FREDERICK ROBINSON, and which House Mr. CANNING says works so well. The law itself it is which has produced the necessity of some great change; and the change proposed is precisely that which a real leveller would suggest. Mr. PEEL has not, it seems,

made his mind up yet. In short, he appears to me to be not a little frightened, now that he has had time to look into this Bill. What Sir JOHN SHELLEY said was very true, namely, that, if they pass this Bill; if they once did away the qualification, there would be *an end of the game*. This is decidedly my opinion, and I am highly amused to see men brought to this state; to a state in which they themselves propose to destroy the thing that they most value, only because they could not, in time, give the people their just share of freedom. To this, as I said to Sir JOHN SHELLEY before, we clearly trace back the present proposition. I think that no Bill will be passed; and then we have the House in this state: having declared the monstrous magnitude of the evil, and having confessed itself unable to find a remedy for any portion of that evil. If I be deceived; if a Bill be passed, containing any one of the provisions at present suggested, the confusion will be such as has seldom been heard of before, and the end will be the total destruction of the game, after thousands upon thousands of acts of oppression and cruelty.

THE POOR.

THIS seems to be a standing subject. LORD JOHN RUSSELL, on the 25th of March, made a motion for a Select Committee to inquire into the practice of paying wages in the shape of poor-rates. I should observe that Mr. NOLAN had a Bill before the House for making a *pauper Militia*, but I am afraid that we shall hear no more of that Bill, seeing that a curious adventure appears to have happened to Mr. NOLAN. Mr. NOLAN, who was Member for that delightful spot called Barnstaple; that overripe piece of political fruit; Mr. NOLAN, who was a Member for that precious Borough, vacated his seat, the other day, upon being made a Welsh Judge. He expected to be re-elected, as a matter of course; or at least, I suppose so. No harm in all this, the reader will say. Oh, no! not the least in the world; but it unfortunately happened that one HODGSON stepped in and got elected instead of Mr. NOLAN! So there is Mr. NOLAN'S Poor-law Bill, without a father. Mr. SCARLETT might have taken the orphan under his protection; but that unfortunate indisposition which the crows of the press took for

death, will, I am afraid, prevent us from ever seeing the face of this sweet babe again, who, like the babe whose death is commemorated by Dryden (and who is said to have got a couple of guineas for the job) just opened its eyes, and, seeing what a wicked world it was coming into, flew back again in haste to the bosom of its creator.

In plain prose, I am cruelly disappointed at this ousting of Mr. NOLAN. Could not he wait another year before he were made a Judge! Cruel man! to deprive me of one half of my winter's sport. The Rabbit and Wid-geon Bill, and the Pauper-army Bill, were counted upon by me, as much as I used to count upon Holy Thursday and Hollentide (as we used to call it) to go to the fairs. But, will nobody take Mr. NOLAN'S child to nurse? In the meanwhile, however, LORD JOHN RUSSELL is coming on with his Committee of Inquiry. Why there needs no Committee, Lord John. The fact is perfectly notorious. The practice is almost universal. But, before we go any further, let us see what was said upon the subject in the Great House.

Lord John Russell then rose to make his promised motion for a Select Committee on the Conditions of the labouring Classes. A Commit-

tee had sat upon the subject some years ago, of which Committee a Right Honourable Gentleman opposite was Chairman. In consequence of the Report of that Committee, a Bill was brought into Parliament, and he (Lord John Russell) was free to confess, that in that Bill a right course of legislation was commenced. But, although a right course of legislation was commenced, yet much remained to be done; and more especially with respect to that which in his present view ought to be the principal object of the Select Committee for which he was about to move; namely, the practice which prevailed in some parts of the country of paying the wages of the labourer out of the poor-rates. This was a practice in every way so indefensible, that it was exceedingly desirable that some measure should be devised to stop such a vagrant system. He would, therefore, move that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the *condition of the labouring poor, especially with a view to the abolition of the practice of paying the wages of the labourer out of the poor's rates*; and that the said Committee do report their opinion thereon to the House, &c.

Mr. Secretary Peel, had no wish whatever to discourage the Noble Lord, in the pursuit of the object which he had in view; but he really thought that the Noble Lord had better limit his motion to the particular object which he desired at present to attain. The Noble Lord now proposed an inquiry into the condition of the labouring poor, generally. It would surely be much better to draw a line, which should define the points to which the Committee were to direct their attention. For, let the Noble Lord consider into what a number of classes "the labouring poor" divided themselves. First, there were the agricultural classes; then, there were those connected with mechanics; then, there were the labouring classes, belonging to towns, not manufacturing; then,

there were the manufacturing classes of labourers. As the Noble Lord's motion now stood, the Committee must inquire into the condition of all these classes; although it was clear from the Noble Lord's own statement, that his object was (and he had taken down the Noble Lord's own expressions) "the appointment of a Committee to *inquire into the practice which prevailed in some parts of the country of paying the wages of the labourer out of the poor-rates*; and to consider what measures might be effectually adopted *for the abolition of such a practice*." If the Noble Lord's motion were to be agreed to as it stood, the Committee would be overwhelmed with the multiplicity of its business. Now, nothing could be more unwise than to devolve on any Committee of that House too extensive a labour. It was of all others the worst mode of obtaining any advantageous result. In any case in which the powers of a Committee were found to be too limited, it was very easy to extend them. If the Noble Lord accepted the words which he (Mr. Peel) had suggested, or would substitute others of similar import, he assured the Noble Lord that he would not throw any difficulty in his way; and that he would not hereafter object to any extension of the powers of the Committee, should such an extension be deemed advisable.

Lord John Russell said, he had no objection whatever to adopt the recommendation of the Right Honourable Gentleman [hear, hear, hear!]

The motion, as modified by Mr. Peel, was then agreed to; and a Select Committee accordingly appointed.

Now, this practice is, as I said before, nearly universal. And how will Lord John go to work to prevent it, or, rather, to abolish it, as he calls it. I do not like Mr. PEEL's amendment. It is a very

bad amendment; but, after the *braggery* of Mr. FREDERICK ROBINSON, it would not be so convenient, perhaps, to inquire into the condition of the labouring classes. This is a thing that ought to have been done long and long ago. It is a thing, the necessity of which I pointed out three years ago; but it is a thing that the Ministers are afraid of. Loose, general, saucy assertions, like those of Mr. FREDERICK ROBINSON, suit them best. Impudent assertions about *joyous country, smiling in plenty*, a people happy, contented and grateful to the great House, these are the things that suit the Government. Let them form a Committee to inquire into the condition of the labouring classes. And what so easy as to ascertain this condition? What so easy as to ascertain the average weight of wages in the different counties, the average price of provisions in the different counties: what so easy as to call up Overseers and Churchwardens from a parish in the North, one in the South, one in the East, one in the West, and one in the centre of each county? What so easy as to bring the surgeons and apothecaries (not being half-pay officers) of those parishes, to describe the state of health of the labourers, to declare what portion

of the ailments and deaths arises from the deficiency of food, deficiency of drink of the right sort, deficiency of clothing, deficiency of fuel; and, in short, deficiency of the necessaries of life. What so easy as all this? How many days of the Session would it occupy a Committee, industrious, zealous, and intelligent as a Committee of law-makers ought to be?

Aye, aye! but this would show England to be peopled by the most miserable set of beings that ever breathed the breath of life, and would, of course, give the lie direct to the incomparable *braggery* of Mr. FREDERICK ROBINSON. No inquiry is so necessary, and none could be so useful as this. This inquiry would explain a great deal about the imprisonment for killing game. It is the one thing needful at this moment, and, therefore, it is precisely what we shall not have.

Lord John appears to have been persuaded to believe, that an inquiry of this sort would be attended with great difficulty; but that to inquire into the practice of giving wages in the shape of poor-rates, would be attended with no difficulty at all. None at all, to a certainty, because the thing is notorious; but then this inquiry about the wages, has this circum-

stance belonging to it, that it is impossible to be of any sort of use; for, as Sir JOHN SEBRIGHT says about buying and selling game, farmers will pay wages out of the poor-rates, in spite of every thing that the Parliament can do, as long as those farmers themselves are pushed by their landlords as they now are.

Lord John, Mr. ROBINSON'S House has done a good deal in the revolutionizing way; but it must do a great deal more before you can compel a farmer to give higher wages than he chooses to give. You must abolish great loads of taxes; you must take from the Jews and Jobbers pretty nearly what they now get out of the taxes; you must put a stop, Lord John, to the swellings of the WEN; before you can abolish this practice, Lord John, you must cause to disappear that strange sight which we now behold, *crowds of smock-frocks in the streets of London, begging for work*: this you must do, before you can abolish the practice of giving wages in the shape of poor-rates.

Will you let LAWYER SCARLETT propose to refuse relief to men able to labour! Will you thus punish the labourer, because you have made the farmer half a pauper; and will you, at the same

time, tax the labourers all over the country, in order to get money to build churches for the Jews and Jobbers, to relieve the poor parsons of the Church of England, and to build houses of correction for the prostitutes of the Jews and Jobbers? Eh, Good God! how do I know what you will do, or what you will not do? This I know, that you can do nothing to draw your legs out of the tar that you are sticking in, unless you come to my shop and, take the recipe, the destruction of the Funding System.

But where was Mr. FREDERICK ROBINSON, when you were talking about wages being paid in the shape of poor-rates, in many parts of the kingdom? Where was he, when Mr. PEEL assented to the existence of the evil? "What!" might he naturally be expected to say, "wages paid in the shape of poor-rates! Want an inquiry upon a subject like this, in this joyous country, smiling in plenty, a people happy, contented, and grateful to the House!" Your motion, my Lord John, was a pretty tough answer to those "loud and long-continued cheers" which Mr. FREDERICK ROBINSON received from *all parts of the House*. If that cheered speech were not a most impudent piece of braggery,

a most disgusting piece of empty boasting, a most gross and filthy and base insult to the public understanding; if that speech were not all this, what *sense* can there be, Lord John, in your motion? That was the most oaf-like piece of insolence that ever was uttered, or your motion, though amended so judiciously by Mr. PEEL, can be no more necessary than it would be to set the gas-lights a blazing at noon, or on Midsummer-day.

But again, how stands the House, as connected with this state of the poor? Who is it that has *made* this nation of paupers? Why those who have made the laws for the last forty years, to be sure. England was not a nation of paupers forty years ago. It is a nation of paupers now. So pauperized is it, that you yourself call for a Committee to inquire into the means of abolishing the practice of paying poor-rates in the shape of pauper-pay. The forty millions a-year paid to Jews, Jobbers, and dead-weight; these are the cause of the paupers. It was the Parliament that made the Debt and the dead-weight; Mr. FREDERICK ROBINSON'S Parliament, therefore, is to be looked to as the cause of the paupers; and to that Parliament he tells us we ought to be *grateful*!

Your Committee, my Lord John, will, I suspect, produce no new information; and I also suspect that it will produce no measure at all. This is another of the things with which you can do nothing. It is a thing not to be stopped in its progress by little measures of prevention. You must go back to the *source* of the evil. The Parish Vestry Bill; all the little attempts of that sort; any

thing that SCARLETT or Mr. NOLAN could have done; any thing that you can do in this way; any of these is like running with a spit of earth to arrest a flood which has broken the embankments. The *cause of the misery that produces the paupers* must be removed, or no change will be produced that will have any sensible effect. Believe me, Lord John, that as long as this Wen keeps swelling; as long as these bands of Jews and Jobbers suck up the fruit of other people's labour, so long will the pauperism continue to increase, in spite of every thing that can be done to prevent it. MAL-THUS'S plan, SCARLETT'S plan, STURGES BOURNE'S plan, Mr. NOLAN'S plan, your plan, if you have any; all your plans will fail. The paupers will, at last, beat you, as the poachers have now beaten the squires; and the estates, if you keep on paying the Jews and Jobbers, will, at last, be divided between these and the paupers. There is no such thing as killing the paupers. They will live in spite of all that can be done to prevent it by any hard-hearted fellows that have the management of them. They will suffer greatly; but they will stick to the land longer than the landlords will; and I think the chances are, that they and the Jews will, at last, divide the whole of the land between them. The present landlords having glided off into the dead-weight, and some of them to the workhouse, a fate which they will most richly have merited.

TURNPIKE LAWS.

I do not know how it is, but, of late, Mr. FREDERICK ROBINSON'S speech has been running in my

head like a new one, as the saying is; and I have always been prone to seek for proofs of the justice of that gentleman's eulogium upon the honourable body to whom he belongs, and who so loudly cheered him when he sang the praises of its wisdom. Amongst the consequences of this proneness of mine has been my strict attention to a passage in the aforesaid Report of the 25th of March, which passage relates to our famous *Turnpike Laws*.

My readers will probably recollect, that a famous General Turnpike Act was passed in the year 1822; that is to say, in the third year of the reign of George the Fourth. This Act went into force, in part, on the first of January 1823; and a part of it was to go into effect on the first of January 1826. Broad wheels were the fashion of the day. "Straight, all the world was dressed in shoulder knots," says SWIFT, in the *Tale of a Tub*. In our case, straight went to work all the wheelwrights and blacksmiths, to prepare for broad wheels; and hundreds and hundreds of thousands of fellies (which require long seasoning), were cut out and put to season; to prepare for this Act. The Act went partly into force on the first of January 1823. It was to be complete: it was general: it repealed all the former laws: it came out of the House a spick-and-span new code. We were now to have clear laws relating to Turnpikes, which were to be smooth as walks in Paradise, and secure as Elysium.

Alas! nothing is perfect here below. For, though Mr. FRANKLAND LEWIS had devoted his whole time to the subject during two

Sessions of Parliament, instead of Elysium, this new Act made the country a perfect Pandemonium. All became misunderstanding, litigation, confusion, extortion practised by the cunning upon the ignorant, outrageous swearing of the farmers in the counties of bad roads and narrow lanes, uncertainty amongst the wheelwrights, grumbling upon the part of the poor jack-ass-cart man, who now paid one third more for his donkey, drawing wood or greens, than the Lord paid for his hundred-pound horse in his gig. Such injustice, such capricious cruelty, such unaccountable perversity seemed fairly to astound the people.

Well, this was not to be borne. The Parliament, therefore, as soon as it met again, began, as in the case of the Marriage Act, to undo what it had done before. It passed two little Acts *à la hâte*, that is to say, flying, as it were, the case being so pressing as not to give time for the preparing of a larger instrument. These two little Acts were given to the country, as it were, to *stay its stomach* till a larger one could be got ready. The larger Act was finished in the month of July 1823. It was pretty nearly as large as the great code of 1822; and it cut that code all up into mincemeat. It hacked it, it chopped it; in many cases, it took away the piece; in other cases, it spliced it; here it contradicted it, there it made exceptions to it; and, Mr. FRANKLAND LEWIS, it finished, so help me God, by declaring **THAT THE TWO ACTS WERE ONE!**

Well, but then there is to be no more of it, is there? The thing

is to end somewhere, is it not? It is not like eternity, to be sure? Reader, look at the following passage, which I take from the report of what passed in this famous House on the 25th of March; and then, perhaps you will be able to say when you think it is likely that we shall come to any thing like *settled law* upon this matter, which interests every body, from one end of the country to the other. Hear what Mr. CRIPPS has to say, and Mr. FRANKLAND LEWIS, and, more particularly, Mr. PEEL; and then refuse, if you can, to join in the eulogium of Mr. FREDERICK ROBINSON! Mind, there was an Act passed in July 1822, which repealed all former General Turnpike Acts, and made us a span new code. This Act was cut up in August 1823. And, now, then, hear Mr. CRIPPS, whom you may know, but whom I do not know, and of whom I never, that I know of, heard of before. *Who he is, what he is, whence he is, who sends him, and on what account*, God only knows: but, here I find him; I find a man of the name of CRIPPS actually moving for leave to bring in a *Bill*, actually beginning "*to legislate*," as the slang is; actually with a motion in his mouth, to "*amend and consolidate the Turnpike-Road Acts!*" Heavens, there is no doing justice to this subject without taking the words of the parties themselves; and here they are:

Mr. Cripps moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend and consolidate the Turnpike-Road Acts. The two Acts of Parliament passed in 1822, under the auspices of his Hon. Friend the Member for Beaumaris (Mr. F. Lewis) were ex-

tremely long and elaborate. There were many clauses in them which it was very difficult to understand, and upon which it was almost impossible for Magistrates to act. The maximum of the penalties imposed under these Acts was fixed at 5*l.*, but no minimum was fixed, so that too much was left to the discretion of magistrates. Again, there was no appeal, unless the penalty amounted to 40*s.* or upwards—a circumstance which had induced magistrates, over and over again, to impose penalties of 39*s.* One great merit of Acts of Parliament was their brevity, and the consolidation of these Acts would have this beneficial effect. He suggested the expediency of consolidating the Highway Acts with the Turnpike Acts. He should be extremely happy to withdraw his motion, if his Honourable Friend (Mr. F. Lewis) was himself disposed to undertake the task of amending and consolidating these Acts.

Mr. F. Lewis said he had no wish to take the subject out of the hands of the Honourable Member, but he should be extremely happy to give him any information which he might be able to communicate. The acts which he (Mr. F. Lewis) had undertaken to carry through the House, at the express desire of the Committee which sat on this subject, contained no less than one hundred and fifty clauses. If they were imperfect, it was not from any want of attention which had been given to the subject; they had occupied his (Mr. F. Lewis's) time and attention during three Sessions. He thought the Honourable Member would fail in his object if he attempted to combine the Highway Acts with the Turnpike Road Acts. He agreed with the Honourable Member that it was desirable to consolidate acts for the purpose of shortening them; but the Highway Acts were themselves extremely long and complicated, and the Honourable Member would find the diffi-

culty of *legislating* on this subject greatly increased by attempting to combine them with the Turnpike Road Acts. Under all the circumstances, he advised the Honourable Member to withdraw his motion.

Sir M. W. Ridley said, that *considerable improvements* had been *already* made in the Turnpike laws. One very material alteration was that of *consolidating all the laws on the subject into two Acts*, and it would have been a still further improvement if they had been all comprised in the Act of last Session. A considerable degree of practical information had been already obtained in consequence of the inquiries which have been set on foot, and he would therefore recommend it to his Honourable Friend (Mr. Cripps) to adopt the advice which had been given him, and to withdraw his motion for the present Session. Great improvements still were necessary, but none so decisively as to require immediate alteration.

Mr. Peel entirely approved of the advice given by his Hon. Friend behind him (Mr. Lewis), and by the Honourable Baronet who had just sat down. He should not now enter into any details, but he would recommend his Honourable Friend (Mr. Cripps) to withdraw his motion for the present, on the ground that we should only have, in another year, to be re-enacting a new measure, and that it would be much preferable to wait until we were in possession of some additional information on the subject. If the House were to legislate in their present imperfect state of information, it would require a *wagon and seven horses to convey all the Acts of Parliament which would become necessary*. He therefore trusted that his Honourable Friend would adopt the suggestion; for he knew him too well to suppose that he had any other object in view than the general interests of the community. [Hear.]

Mr. Cripps said, his motives had been very properly stated by his Right Honourable Friend who had just sat down. As a *Magistrate* and a *Commissioner*, before whom repeated complaints had been made of the inconveniences arising from the present laws, he had felt it his duty to come forward for the purpose of ascertaining whether the Hon. Member (Mr. Lewis) meant to *renew the measure* he had some time back introduced to the House. However, as it seemed to be the general opinion that it would be preferable to *postpone the subject to some future period*, he had no objection to withdraw his motion. [Hear, hear!] The motion was accordingly withdrawn.

So, so! And, thus, we are not to have the *mending* and *consolidating* and *legislating* of Mr. CRIPPS, whom I now discover to be a "*magistrate and a commissioner*," and who so politely says, that he shall be happy to leave the business in the hands of Mr. FRANKLAND LEWIS, who tells the House that he bestowed his "*time and attention during three Sessions of Parliament*," in the contriving and framing and bringing forth those very Acts, the second of which cut the first to pieces, and the two taken together form, according to Mr. CRIPPS, a thing, "*very difficult to understand, and upon which it is almost impossible for magistrates to act!*" Come, now, Mr. CRIPPS (whoever you be) if such be really the character of Mr. FRANKLAND LEWIS's Acts; if his time and attention, during three whole Sessions, have produced such a result, why would you be "*happy to see the work of amending and consolidating in his hands!*" I ask you *why* this would make you "*happy?*" Do you think, that Mr. Frankland

Lewis's mind has undergone any material change? I am saying nothing about that mind. The honourable personage may, for aught I know, have the clearest head in the world; but, if it be true (and nobody said it was not), that the present Acts are "*very difficult to understand*;" if it be true, that it is "*almost impossible for magistrates to act*" upon them; if this be true, why, my dear Mr. Justice CRIPPS, why should you be "*extremely happy*" to see this same Mr. LEWIS's legislating talents employed again; and that, too, upon this very same subject?

Mr. Lewis would be "*extremely happy to give him (Mr. Cripps) any information on the subject.*" Why, God-a-mercy, Mr. LEWIS, you have given us two long Acts of Parliament; and what more can you give us, in this way? If these Acts do not contain the necessary *information*, when and where and how are we to come at it? This I know, that the last Act contains a clause which takes away both *indictment* and *action* for any *extortions*, however impudent and whatever their amount, committed by toll-collectors at turnpike-gates! I know this, and I also know, that LEVI, the Jew lessee, said, at Bow-street, that Mr. Frankland Lewis and the Clerk who drew the Bill, ASSURED HIM, Levi, that he would have a right to take 4½d. on the Kensington-road, for a one-horse cart, after the passing of the last Act! I know that Levi said this: I will swear that Levi said this: I have, in my affidavit, now before the Court of King's Bench, sworn that he said this: I can bring many witnesses to swear, that both Levi and his

attorney said, before the magistrates at Bow-street, that *they were with Mr. Frankland Lewis while the Bill was going through the House* (that cheered Mr. Robinson), and that he assured them that they were to continue to take the 4½d. after the passing of the last Act! This Jew and his attorney might tell a lie: nothing much more probable, the reader will say: but, this is the case; they *must* have lied; or, what would become of the "*information*" possessed by Mr. Frankland Lewis? The Jew must have lied; but, fortunately for him, there is a clause in the last Act, which protects him against *indictment*, and even against *action* for taking (though by force) *any sum too much, as toll*! I have heard of a man who has paid ten pounds too much. He has *no remedy*. They have his money, and they laugh at him. A Mitcham carrier complained, at Union-hall, of extortions to a considerable amount. He got a *decision in his favour*; but *no penalty*! For this beautiful Act, this result of three Sessions of *attention*, leaves the magistrate the power, in case of conviction, TO IMPOSE NO PENALTY AT ALL! And, this is what they did at Union-hall, in the Borough of Southwark. This is what is called "*legislating*!"

Sir M.W. RIDLEY, has, however, discovered, that "*considerable improvements have already been made in the Turnpike-Laws.*" We have just seen a specimen or two of these "*improvements.*" But this Sir M. W. Ridley is mistaken if he thinks that these laws are "*consolidated into two Acts.*" Mr. LEWIS had, in 1822, got them into *one Act*; but, this Act has already got *three young ones*; so that the whole family now consists of *four*.

But, if there have been "considerable improvement," what, if Mr. CRIPPS' account be true, must the law (the House's law) have been before Mr. Lewis began to "legislate" upon the subject? If it be now "very difficult to understand;" if it be such, that it is "almost impossible for magistrates to act" on it; if this be true, and if it have been considerably improved by Mr. Frankland Lewis, what pretty laws must have been passed before by that House which Mr. Robinson so praised, and by which he was so cheered!

Mr. PEEL is for waiting for additional information. What! Does he want information too? About what? Were not three sessions long enough to make inquiries? And inquiries about what, too? What! Sweep away a whole code, as was the case in 1822, and now say, that you wait for information to know what to do! What a mess it is all taken together! Here is Mr. CRIPPS declaring, that the law, as it now stands, is *very difficult to understand*, and is *almost impossible to be acted on*; and here is Mr. Peel calling on Mr. CRIPPS to wait for some information on the subject; and, hereupon, Mr. CRIPPS agrees to wait: and, thus, we are left with this comforting reflection, that the law is very difficult to understand, and almost impossible to be acted on, and that the House (at present at least) does not know how to alter it!

However, I must say, that, if I had been in Mr. LEWIS's place, I should have told Mr. CRIPPS, that he ought not to conclude that other Magistrates could not understand the law, merely because he could not. I think I should have kicked a little if I had been in

Mr. LEWIS's place. The thing to say, however, is, that here are laws, which are, at best, most shockingly defective, and that it does not appear that the House possesses the capacity to make them better. Three Sessions of Parliament have been spent upon the business. It is acknowledged by the House itself that the law is very defective, and the Minister recommends to wait for further information; that is to say, for more knowledge, lest they should make the thing worse. This is, almost in so many words, acknowledging the incapacity of the House to frame laws even relative to so simple a thing as the Turnpike Roads, which laws shall not be productive of mischief.

Now, my real opinion is, that a Reformed House of Commons would contain one hundred men, each of whom would be capable of drawing up a General Turnpike Act, that every man of common capacity would clearly understand. I know I could draw up such a Bill myself; but, while the House remains what it is, we shall always be hampered and teased and pestered in this sort of way. I know of an old dotard, who brags of the great number of years that he has been a lawgiver, and who skulks into holes and corners to backbite and calumniate me. This man has not, in the course of his whole life, done the country a thousandth part so much service as I have done it by correcting abuses relative to these Turnpike Roads. Fine enough it is to talk about Patriotism and Whigism and CHARLES FOXISM; very appropriate glory this for a dull sot like him to whom I allude; but let him show us, in all the acts of his whole life, so much

public good as that which has been effected by me by merely skrewing up this one set of Jews. Let that oaf understand that *I hear of his calumnies*; and let him understand, also, that, when an opportunity shall offer (and offer it will) I will chastise him for it. I say chastise him, mind, and I will do it as sure as he is alive.

One word more about the Turnpike Acts. They are, it seems, to remain as they are, sine die. But, will nobody move to repeal that clause which I have so often mentioned, and which has been the cause of all the extortions, and which will always be the cause of all the extortions? I ask this question, and there I leave the matter for the present.

TO THE
EDITOR OF THE REGISTER.

SIR,

I NOTICED, in your Register of the 13th ult. an article on the subject of British Leghorn Bonnets. Perhaps it will be gratifying to you to know, that the Society of Arts have rewarded 17 specimens sent in, out of 21. It is needless to enumerate the successful ones, because the Secretary of the Society will make each claimant acquainted officially with their success; but, Sir, it cannot fail to inspire you with fresh zeal in a cause which you have so laudably and indefatigably taken up, and which, under your able and active pen, promises to add, at no distant day, a new, extensive, and profitable manufacture to British enterprise and industry.

To your early publication of

this discovery in your Cottage Economy, the present successful candidates owe their rewards; and the notice of the above subject in your next Register may stimulate others to compete for the prize in the next Session; and as we have now a whole season before us, I doubt not we shall make great progress towards perfection.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

Z

London, April 1, 1824.

AMERICAN GRAFFS.

THEY are (*Wednesday*) on their way from Liverpool, and will arrive by about *Monday next*. I hear, that they are in excellent condition. I cannot, until next Register, make out the whole of the List; but, I can now state, that there are *twenty-one sorts of Apples*, and *one*, if not *two*, sorts of *Pears*. I shall put *fifty graffs* into a packet; shall pack them in hay; cover them with canvass; and, in short, do with them as I did last year. I think that we shall not be able to get any packets made up before about *next Wednesday*, the 7th April.—Packets may then be had at No. 183, Fleet-street, or by coach, if written for.—The price of a packet will be *a sovereign*.—I cannot make any distinction in the contents of different packets. Every packet must contain the same as every other; for, to manage the thing in any other way would lead to endless trouble and endless mistakes.—The next Register shall contain a complete Catalogue of the sorts, with an account of the several fruits.

SPRING WHEAT.

IN consequence of the number of applications which have been made for the Seed of Spring Wheat, to sow for the purpose of getting the proper materials to make bonnets, Mr. Cobbett has ordered a further supply. Some of this Wheat will be to be had, in the course of two or three days, in Fleet-street, at the same price at which the first lot was sold; namely, ten shillings for a single bushel, and eleven shillings a bushel for a sack, or any number of bushels exceeding that quantity.

SEEDS,

Sold at No. 183, Fleet-Street.

I HAVE some Swedish Turnip Seed, sowed under my own direction, and from plants of my own selecting, in Hampshire. I will pledge myself for its being as good as it can possibly be. I have some Mangel Wurzel Seed, grown by a man on whom I can place perfect reliance; I sell the former at fifteen-pence a pound for any quantity under ten pounds, and at a shilling a pound for any larger quantity. The Mangel Wurzel Seed at eighteen-pence a pound for ten pounds, or any quantity above it; and two shillings a pound for any quantity smaller than ten pounds. If I send to the

Country, I shall send in linen bags, besides a bag of paper. The linen bags will be sewed up; and I shall charge nothing for the bags or for the booking at the coach-office.

Also, early York Cabbage Seed.
—Sugar-loaf Cabbage.

(From America.)—Fine Melon Seed.—Pumpkin Seed.—Early Indian Corn.

SUBSCRIPTION FOR BYRNE.

Mr. Bell	-	-	-	£1	0	0
Homo	-	-	-	2	0	0
Lewes Flanigan, Esq.	5	0	0			
Mr. Cobbett	-	-	-	1	0	0
Crispin	-	-	-	0	2	6
Thomas Hardy	-	-	-	0	10	0
C. W., Maidstone	-	-	-	0	10	0
Bell's Life in London	2	0	0			
J. B.	-	-	-	1	0	0
J. G. D.	-	-	-	1	0	0
R. B.	-	-	-	0	10	0
E. D. Esq.	-	-	-	2	0	0
Z.	-	-	-	0	10	0
Mr. Harmer	-	-	-	2	2	0
A Lover of Fair Play	1	1	0			
George Fordham	-	1	0	0		
H. P.	-	-	-	1	0	0
R. L.	-	-	-	1	0	0
G. H.	-	-	-	0	10	0
E. H.	-	-	-	0	10	0
H.	-	-	-	2	0	0
Some Friends at Liver-						
pool, by the hands of						
Thos. Smith	-	-	-	2	18	6
C. Taylor, Esq. M. P.	5	0	0			
E. Heagren Gibbs, Esq.	1	0	0			
Mr. S—e	-	-	-	1	0	0
Mr. Hurst	-	-	-	0	5	0
H. no B.	-	-	-	0	12	0

MARKETS.

Average Prices of CORN throughout ENGLAND, for the week ending 20th March.

Per Quarter.	s.	d.
Wheat	65	11
Rye	42	4
Barley	36	10
Oats	25	5
Beans	40	7
Peas	39	6

Corn Exchange, Mark Lane.

Quantities and Prices of British Corn, &c. sold and delivered in this Market, during the week ended Saturday, 20th March.

Qrs.	£.	s.	d.	s.	d.
Wheat.. 6,269 for 21,398	5	7	Average, 68	3	
Barley 5,987....11,271	19	037	7	
Oats.. 13,656....17,691	13	1125	10	
Rye.....8.....	17	12	0.....44	0	
Beans.. 2,603....5,051	4	638	9	
Peas....1,306....3,025	5	1040	2	

Friday, March 26.—There are tolerable good arrivals of most kinds of Grain this week. There has been rather more doing in fine parcels of Wheat to-day, but other qualities still remain dull. Barley, Beans and Peas each continue as reported on Monday. There have been good quantities of Oats sold to-day, on terms fully equal to those of the beginning of the week.

Monday, March 29.—The arrivals of Grain last week were tolerably good, but of Oats they were very large. This morning there is only a moderate quantity of Wheat, Barley, Beans, and Peas,

from Essex, Kent, and Suffolk, and but few vessels fresh up with Oats, so that the Market to-day is composed chiefly of good quantities of all descriptions of Corn, which remain over from former supplies. The general quality of Wheat is damp, and our Millers neglect such parcels, which therefore may be considered very dull; but prime dry samples have experienced more briskness in sale, though not at higher prices.

The Maltsters have purchased Barley with more freedom to-day, and it is 1s. per qr. higher, but middling and inferior sorts are exceedingly heavy. Beans fully maintain last quotations. Grey Peas are also quite as dear. Boiling and White Peas sell heavily at the terms of this day se'nnight. There is more business doing in Oats to-day, and this trade is the turn dearer. A great clearance has been made to-day of Oat samples. The Flour trade is dull, except for very prime marks.

Prices on board Ship as under.

Wheat, red, (old)	64s. to 72s.
— white, (old)	50s. — 78s.
— red, (new)	44s. — 50s.
— fine	52s. — 56s.
— superfine	58s. — 64s.
— white, (new)	50s. — 54s.
— fine	55s. — 63s.
— superfine	66s. — 69s.
Flour, per sack	55s. — 60s.
— Seconds	50s. — 55s.
— North Country	46s. — 50s.

Price of Bread.—The price of the 4lb. Loaf is stated at 10½d. by the full-priced Bakers.

ACCOUNT OF WHEAT, &c. ARRIVED IN THE PORT OF LONDON,
From March 22 to March 27, both inclusive.

Whence.	Wheat.	Barley.	Malt.	Oats.	Beans.	Flour.
Aberdeen	1711
Aldbro'	128	661	40	14
Alemouth	662
Banff	701
Berwick	1159	35
Boston	6373
Bridport	200
Bridlington
Clay	15	440
Dundee	195
Colchester	210	54	405	10	82	597
Harwich	556	300	1539	387	30	500
Leigh	1007	60	114	332	10
Maldon	598	39	20	364	949
Exeter	170	170	30
Gainsbro'	3	100
Grimsby	200
Hull	3933	280
Inverness	30	20
Ipswich	240	280	1091	275
Kent	987	850	226	281	686	945
Lyme	160	5	121
Lynn	406	3	1296	365
Newcastle
Newport
Portsmouth	100
Poole	10	20
Plymouth	146
Spalding	320
Southampton	40	200	100
Stockton	50	200
Southwold	272	708	104
Wells
Whitby	260
Wisbeach	323	3684
Woodbridge	408	846	57	60	179	320
Yarmouth	275	130	808	20	400
Cork	1115
Dublin	825
Dunkald	300
Waterford
Foreign	1915
Total	5675	4471	4374	25868	2123	5646

Aggregate Quantity of other kinds of Pulse imported during the Week:

Rye, —; Pease, 1060; Tares, 940; Linseed, 428; Rapeseed, 450;

Brank, 2975; Mustard, 205; Flax, —; and Seeds, 438 quarters.

SEEDS, &c.

Price on board Ship as under.

	s.	s.
Clover, red, Foreign per cwt	58	94
— white, ditto..ditto ..	52	86
— red English, ditto ..	66	92
— white, ditto..ditto ..	60	84
Rye Grass	per qr...	26 48
Turnip, new, white..per bush.	10	12
— red & green ..ditto..	10	16
— yellow Swedes ditto..	9	11
Mustard, white	ditto..	7 11
— brown.....	ditto..	8 14
Carraway	per cwt	50 52
Coriander.....	ditto ..	10 13
Sanfoin.....	per qr...	30 42
Trefoil	per cwt	20 28
Ribgrass	ditto ..	35 54
Canary, common ..	per qr...	40 44
— fine	ditto ..	46 55
Tares	per bush.	5 7
Hempseed	per qr...	40 45
Linseed for crushing		
— Foreign	ditto ..	30 40
— fine English		
— for sowing	ditto ..	42 50
Rapeseed, 25 <i>l.</i> to 27 <i>l.</i>	per last.	
Linseed Oil Cake, 11 <i>l.</i> to 11 <i>l.</i> 11 <i>s.</i>	per 1000	
Foreign ditto, 6 <i>l.</i> 6 <i>s.</i> to 7 <i>l.</i>	per ton.	
Rape Cake, 6 <i>l.</i> 10 <i>s.</i> to 7 <i>l.</i>	per ton.	

Monday, March 29.—The arrivals from Ireland last week were 90 firkins of Butter, and 1,140 bales of Bacon; and from Foreign ports, 1,420 casks of Butter.

City, 31 March 1824.

BACON.

This article has declined about 1*s.* per cwt. since our last quotations; owing, probably, to the necessity of selling, on the part of some holders.—On board, 51*s.* to 52*s.*—Landed, 53*s.* to 54*s.*

BUTTER.

The present sharp weather has had a favourable effect upon the Butter market: the demand has increased, and rather better prices are obtainable.—Carlow, 80*s.* to 85*s.*—Waterford, 70*s.* to 76*s.*—Dublin, 68*s.* to 74*s.*—Cork, or Limerick, 74*s.* to 76*s.*—Dutch, 102*s.* to 106*s.*

CHEESE

Is advancing in every part of the country; and the factors seem confident, that the shortness of the stocks will cause the prices to be maintained.—Old Cheshire, 80*s.* to 90*s.*; New, 65*s.* to 80*s.*—Double Gloucester, 66*s.* to 72*s.*; Single, 56*s.* to 66*s.*—Cheddei, 80*s.* to 88*s.*

SMITHFIELD, Monday, March 29.

Per Stone of 8 pounds (alive).

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef	3	4	to	4 4
Mutton.....	4	0	—	4 10
Veal.....	4	8	—	5 6
Pork.....	4	4	—	5 4
Beasts ... 2,735			Sheep ... 14,780	
Calves 140			Pigs 210	

NEWGATE (same day).

Per Stone of 8 pounds (dead).

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef	2	4	to	3 4
Mutton.....	3	0	—	3 10
Veal.....	3	8	—	5 8
Pork.....	3	8	—	5 4

LEADENHALL (same day).

Per Stone of 8 pounds (dead).

	s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef	2	4	to	3 8
Mutton.....	3	0	—	3 10
Veal.....	3	4	—	5 4
Pork.....	3	8	—	5 4

POTATOES.

SPITALFIELDS.—per Ton.

Ware	£2 5 to £3 15
Middlings.....	1 15 — 2 0
Chats.....	1 15 — 0 0
Common Red..	0 0 — 0 0

BOROUGH.—per Ton.

Ware.....	£2 5 to £3 15
Middlings.....	1 15 — 2 0
Chats.....	1 15 — 0 0
Common Red..	2 10 — 3 0

HAY and STRAW, per Load.

Smithfield.—Hay....	75s. to 110s.
Straw...	40s. to 50s.
Clover...	90s. to 120s.

St. James's.—Hay....	70s. to 110s.
Straw...	42s. to 51s.
Clover...	90s. to 120s.

Whitechapel.—Hay....	80s. to 110s.
Straw...	40s. to 46s.
Clover	100s. to 130s.

COUNTRY CORN MARKETS.

By the QUARTER, excepting where otherwise named; from Wednesday to Saturday last, inclusive.

The Scotch Markets are the Returns of the Week before.

	Wheat.		Barley.		Oats.		Beans.		Pease.	
	s.	to s. d.	s.	to s. d.	s.	to s. d.	s.	to s. d.	s.	to s. d.
Aylesbury	52	68 0	32	35 0	23	28 0	30	43 0	42	43 0
Banbury	52	68 0	30	36 0	20	30 0	32	46 0	0	0 0
Basingstoke.....	50	71 0	30	34 0	20	25 0	39	46 0	0	0 0
Chelmsford.....	58	68 0	34	38 0	22	28 0	28	40 0	32	36 0
Derby	60	80 0	38	42 0	23	31 0	36	56 0	0	0 0
Devizes	46	69 0	29	37 0	25	30 0	34	48 0	0	0 0
Dorchester.....	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0
Exeter.....	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0
Guildford.....	52	72 0	32	36 0	23	31 0	38	50 0	40	42 0
Henley	52	80 0	30	37 0	22	30 0	38	43 0	40	46 0
Horncastle	60	66 0	27	37 0	18	27 0	35	50 0	0	0 0
Hungerford.....	48	66 0	26	33 0	18	30 0	34	44 0	0	0 0
Lewes	57	58 0	30	36 0	23	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0
Lynn	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0
Newbury	42	64 0	19	33 0	21	30 0	36	46 0	38	42 0
Newcastle	50	74 0	38	40 0	23	30 0	40	44 0	40	48 0
Northampton.....	57	64 0	30	34 0	22	27 6	30	37 0	30	36 0
Nottingham	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0
Reading	48	76 0	28	37 0	19	26 0	35	42 0	37	43 0
Sherborne	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0
Stamford.....	60	68 0	32	38 0	20	30 0	37	50 0	0	0 0
Swansea	68	0 0	40	0 0	25	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0
Truro	64	0 0	35	0 0	26	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0
Uxbridge.....	50	73 0	32	38 0	23	31 0	34	42 0	34	43 0
Warminster.....	40	70 0	23	39 0	20	28 0	34	48 0	0	0 0
Winchester	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0
Yarmouth.....	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	0 0
Dalkeith *	26	35 0	26	38 0	20	28 0	22	27 0	22	27 0
Haddington*	25	37 0	24	31 6	22	30 0	21	25 6	20	24 0

* Dalkeith and Haddington are given by the boll.—The Scotch boll for Wheat, Rye, Pease, and Beans, is three per cent. more than 4 bushels. The boll of Barley and Oats, is about 6 bushels Winchester, or as 6 to 8 compared with the English quarter.

Liverpool, March 23.—Although the importations have been very far from excessive, yet, from the business done in the Grain and Flour trade during the past week, they have considerably exceeded the demand, and in consequence a further reduction of 3*d.* per 70 lbs. on Wheats, and 1*d.* to 2*d.* per 45 lbs. on Oats, may be justly noted. Of the decline during the above period, Flour and Oatmeal have partaken in about 2*s.* per sack, Malt 3*d.* per nine gallons, and Beans and Peas 1*s.* 6*d.* to 2*s.* per quarter from the prices of this day se'nnight. The market of this day was extremely heavy and dull, and the few sales effected were quite corroborative of the general reduction in prices of Grain, Flour, and Oatmeal, since Tuesday last.

WHEAT, per 70lbs.				OATS, per 45lbs.				FLOUR, per 280lbs.				
s. d.		s. d.		s. d.		s. d.		s. d.		s. d.		
English	9	0	to 11	0	English	3	10 — 4	2	English	52	0 — 55	0
Scotch	9	0	— 11	0	Scotch	3	10 — 4	2	Irish per			
Welsh	9	0	— 11	0	Welsh	3	10 — 4	2	280lbs.	48	0 — 54	0
Irish	8	0	— 10	3	Irish	3	3 — 3	10	OATMEAL, 240lbs.			
Foreign	0	0	— 0	0	BEANS, per qr.				English	33	0 — 37	0
BARLEY, per 60lbs.				English	48	0 — 52	0	Scotch	32	0 — 35	0	
English	5	0	— 6	6	Scotch	47	0 — 48	0	Irish	30	0 — 32	0
Scotch	5	0	— 6	6	Irish	47	0 — 48	0	INDIAN CORN per			
Welsh	5	0	— 6	6	Dutch	47	0 — 48	0	quar.	0	0 — 0	0
Irish	4	10	— 5	4	PEASE, per qr.				RAPE SEED, per			
MALT.				Boiling	46	0 — 52	0	last £27.				
Per 9 gal.	8	3 — 9	6	Grey	38	0 — 46	0					

Imported into Liverpool from the 16th to the 22d of March, 1824, inclusive:—Wheat, 4,360; Oats, 13,826; Barley, 1,605; Malt, 1,706; Beans, 1,463; Peas, 428 quarters. Flour, 2,286 sacks, per 280 lbs.; American Flour, 7,838 barrels.

Norwich, March 27.—There was a very dull market for the sale of Corn to-day; best Wheat with difficulty fetched 61*s.* per quarter; and Barley, of the best quality, did not exceed 34*s.* Oats, 24*s.* to 29*s.* per quarter.

Bristol, March 27.—Very little business is doing here in Corn, &c. The sales that are made may be quoted nearly as follows:—Best Wheat from 8*s.* 6*d.* to 8*s.* 9*d.*; inferior ditto, 5*s.* 6*d.* to 7*s.* 3*d.*; Barley, 2*s.* 9*d.* to 4*s.* 7*d.*; Beans, 3*s.* 9*d.* to 5*s.* 3*d.*; Oats, 2*s.* to 3*s.* 6*d.*; and Malt, 4*s.* 6*d.* to 7*s.* 3*d.* per bushel. Flour, Seconds, 30*s.* to 50*s.* per bag.

Ipswich, March 27.—We had to-day a very short supply of all Grain, and prices were rather higher for Barley, but lower for other Grain. General currency as follows:—Wheat, 56*s.* to 67*s.*; Barley, 30*s.* to 38*s.*; Beans, 37*s.* to 39*s.*; Peas, 34*s.* to 36*s.*; and Oats, 27*s.* to 29*s.* per quarter.

Wisbeach, March 27.—We had rather a brisk sale for Wheat, which sold freely; the best runs fetched from 62*s.* to 64*s.* per quarter; a prime sample or two as high as 66*s.* Beans were a trifle higher. Oats without alteration.

Boston, March 24.—This market continues to be thinly supplied with samples of Grain, which continue heavy on sale, at the following prices:—Wheat, 60*s.* to 66*s.*; Oats, 17*s.* to 23*s.*; Barley, 34*s.* to 38*s.*; and Beans, 35*s.* to 40*s.* per quarter.

Wakefield, March 26.—We have again a very large arrival of Grain, particularly Wheat, fine samples of which have been offering at a decline of full 2*s.* per quarter, but if extensive sales are made, a further decline must be submitted to; second and inferior sorts are nearly

unsaleable. Mealing Oats are 1*d.* per stone, and Shelling, 1*s.* per load lower. Malting Barley of every description is dull, at a decline of full 2*s.* per quarter. Beans, both old and new, are 2*s.* per quarter lower, and little doing at that decline. Maple Peas are 3*s.* to 4*s.* lower; Malt 2*s.* per load of six bushels, and Flour 1*s.* to 2*s.* per bag cheaper. Rapeseed dull at a decline of 1*l.* per last.—Wheat, 60*s.* to 72*s.* per quarter; Mealing Oats, 13*d.* to 14*d.* per stone of 14 lbs.; Shelling, 35*s.* to 36*s.* per load of 261 lbs.; Barley, 36*s.* to 40*s.*; Beans, old and new, 40*s.* to 50*s.* 63 lbs. per bushel; Maple Peas, 48*s.* to 52*s.*; Tares, 48*s.* to 60*s.* per quarter; Malt, 44*s.* to 48*s.* per load of 6 bushels; Flour, 56*s.* to 58*s.* per sack of 280 lbs.; and Rapeseed, 27*l.* to 28*l.* per last.

AVERAGE PRICE OF CORN, sold in the Maritime Counties of England and Wales, for the Week ended March 20, 1824.

	Wheat.		Barley.		Oats.	
	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
London	68	7	39	1	37	4
Essex	67	11	38	8	27	3
Kent.....	65	7	38	9	27	5
Sussex.....	62	11	34	3	24	1
Suffolk.....	66	6	36	10	27	3
Cambridgeshire	64	8	34	9	21	4
Norfolk	64	10	36	5	26	1
Lincolnshire	65	6	37	8	24	4
Yorkshire	65	3	37	3	23	9
Durham	66	10	37	8	28	7
Northumberland	63	1	39	6	27	2
Cumberland	64	4	36	5	29	2
Westmoreland	63	2	39	0	28	6
Lancashire	70	7	36	0	29	6
Cheshire	66	10	46	6	25	1
Gloucestershire.....	69	6	33	5	23	9
Somersetshire	68	5	33	9	22	5
Monmouthshire	65	1	36	8	24	0
Devonshire	67	8	32	9	20	11
Cornwall	63	6	35	0	24	0
Dorsetshire	68	0	32	0	22	6
Hampshire	63	0	34	3	24	6
North Wales	72	4	41	6	22	10
South Wales	63	1	35	9	21	8

COUNTRY CATTLE AND MEAT MARKETS, &c.

Norwich Castle Meadow, March 27.—There was a good show of prime stock here to-day, and a great deal of business transacted: Fat Scots fetched 6*s.* 6*d.* to 7*s.* per stone of 14 lbs.; lean Beasts, from 4*s.* to 4*s.* 3*d.* per stone; Mutton, 6*s.* 6*d.* per stone; Hoggets fetched from 27*s.* to 34*s.* per head; fat Pigs, 6*s.* 6*d.* per stone. Good Horses are very scarce, and cart Horses and Colts have advanced full 30 per cent. since last Michaelmas.

Horncastle, March 27.—Beef, 6*s.* 4*d.* to 6*s.* 6*d.* per stone of 14 lbs.; Mutton, 5*d.* to 6*d.*; Pork, 5*d.* to 6*d.*; and Veal, 7*d.* to 8*d.* per lb.

Bristol, March 25.—Beef, 5*d.* to 5½*d.*; Mutton, 6*d.* to 6½*d.*; and Pork, 4½*d.* to 5½*d.* per lb. sinking offal.

At *Morpeth* market on Wednesday, there was rather a short supply of Cattle, but a good many Sheep; there being fewer buyers, prices continue much the same.—Beef, from 5*s.* to 5*s.* 9*d.*; and Mutton, 6*s.* to 6*s.* 9*d.* per stone, sinking offals.

Price of HOPS, per Cwt. in the BOROUGH.

Monday, March 29.—In Hops there is no alteration in price.

Maidstone, March 25.—The Hop-trade remains just as last advised, and will most probably continue so until the appearance of the bine. The accounts continue bad as to the stock, and the opinion is generally against the duty.

COAL MARKET, March 26.

<i>Ships at Market.</i>	<i>Ships sold.</i>	<i>Price.</i>
66½ Newcastle...	42	32 <i>s.</i> 0 <i>d.</i> to 40 <i>s.</i> 6 <i>d.</i>
36 Sunderland	27½	31 <i>s.</i> 0 <i>d.</i> —40 <i>s.</i> 9 <i>d.</i>

OILS, per Ton, of 252 Gallons.

New Greenland Whale	£. 19 0
Pale Seal	26 0
Spermaceti	40 0
Linseed	26 10
Pale Rape	34 0
Galipoli, per 236 gallons	50 0

COTTON MARKET.

Friday, March 26.—This week the inquiry for Cotton has been general, without leading to so much business as was done last week; the sales are about 800 bales, at our previous currency, taken chiefly by the trade; good Bengals continue in request for the country, and at present are rather scarce. By public sale this forenoon, 1,052 bags Egyptian Cotton, very good quality, duty paid, were chiefly sold 11½*d.* to 11¾*d.*